

Remarks/Arguments

Claims 1-31 were rejected under 35 USC §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Claims 24-26 were rejected under 35 USC §112, first paragraph, because the specification was enabling for angiogenesis, the examiner did not believe it was enabling for all diseases. Claims 1, 6, 8 and 22 were rejected under 35 USC §102(b) as being anticipated by Giraldi et al. US 3,074,943. Claims 1, 5-8, 22 and 30-31 were rejected under 35 USC §102(b) as being anticipated by Cutler et al. US 3,097,205. Claims 1, 6 and 22 were rejected under 35 USC §102(b) as being anticipated by Cutler et al. US 3,209,003. Claims 1, 6 and 22 were rejected under 35 USC §102(b) as being anticipated by Cutler et al. US 3,136,816. Claims 1, 6 and 22 were rejected under 35 USC §102(b) as being anticipated by Thurston US 2474194. Claim 1 was rejected under 35 USC §102(b) as being anticipated by Fischer US 3,855,220. Claims 1, 6, 8-9 and 30-31 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Newton et al. US 5,062,882. Claims 1, 6 and 30-31 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Riebel et al. US 6,284,710.

Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested in light of this amendment and the following remarks. Applicants have amended the claims to expedite prosecution of the application. This amendment is not intended to acquiesce to the rejections raised by the Examiner and Applicants reserve the right to pursue broader claim subject matter in follow-on applications.

Claims 1-31 were rejected under 35 USC §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Claim 22 was amended to clarify the invention. Applicants request reconsideration of the 35 USC §112, second paragraph, rejections in view of the amended Claims.

Claims 1, 6, 8 and 22 were rejected under 35 USC §102(b) as being anticipated by Giraldi et al. US 3,074,943. Applicants request reconsideration of the rejection in view of the amended Claims.

Claims 1, 5-8, 22 and 30-31 were rejected under 35 USC §102(b) as being anticipated by Cutler et al. US 3,097,205. Applicants request reconsideration of the rejection in view of the amended Claims.

specific toxicity, and that haloalkyl and methylthio substituents were most preferred "Z-substituents". Thus Riebel et al. teach away from the pyrazol-5-yl-amine substituted triazines of the present invention. Applicants contend that the '710 patent does not render obvious the disubstituted triazines of the present invention.

In view of the above, none of the references, taken singly or in any combination, describes or suggests compounds of the present invention. Applicants therefore submit that the compounds of the present invention are not obvious in view of the cited prior art.

It is therefore respectfully submitted that Claims 21-23, 27-29 and 32 are now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections, and allowance of Claims 21-23, 27-29 and 32 are respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Joseph W. Bullock
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)
Registration No.: 37,103
Phone: (805) 447-7966
Date: December 6, 2004

Please send all future correspondence to:
US Patent Operations/JWB
Dept. 4300, M/S 27-4-A
AMGEN INC.
One Amgen Center Drive
Thousand Oaks, California 91320-1799